

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/772,203	01/29/2001	Heino Hameleers	34648-00464USPX	9668	
75	90 10/28/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Richard J. Moura, Esq.			PEREZ, ANGELICA		
Jenkens & Gilch 3200 Fountain F			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1445 Ross Ave.			2684		
Dallas, TX 75	202-2799		DATE MAILED: 10/28/200	DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)					
	09/772,203		HAMELEERS ET	AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
	Angelica M. Perez		2684					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2001.								
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ Th	is action is non-final.							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 193	13 C.D. 11, 4	.00 0.0. 210.					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application	ı .							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.								
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:								
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received	d.						
2. Certified copies of the priority document			ion No. <u>09/772,20</u>	<u>13</u> .				
Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).								
a) X The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.								
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.								
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)								
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 	5) 🔲 Not	tice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper N Patent Application (P					

Art Unit: 2684

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 5,6,7,11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Valentine (Valentine et al, US Patent No. 6504839).

Regarding claim 1, Valentine teaches of a method for data connections in a cellular mobile communication network with at least one core network (figure 1, item 110) and at least one access network (figure 1, item 221), said method comprising the steps of: receiving a connection request in a first control node of the core network from a first access network (column 2, lines 13-18); transferring of a call control from the first control node to a gateway control node interacting with a home location register that manages subscriber data of a called party (figure 100, items 111, 110, 131 and 134); fetching of routing information by the gateway control node from said home location register(column 9, lines 38-43); transferring of the call control from the gateway control node to a control node that controls the access network serving the called party (figure 2, items 211 and 232); calculating parameter values describing possible payload

connections between the core network and the access networks; comparing parameter values describing possible payload connections between the core network and the first access network, with parameter values of possible payload connections between the core network and the access network serving the called party (column 4, line 62); selecting transcoding and data rate of the payload in the respective payload transmission resources(column 1, lines 58-62), according to the results of the comparison; and setting up and through-connection of the selected payload transmission resources (column 10, lines 36-55).

Page 3

Regarding claim 5, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1, where an internerwork function is linked in for the payload transmission (column 2, lines 8-11).

Regarding claim 6, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1, including sending a calling party identification, as part of the call control handover between the control nodes (column 2, lines 30-32).

Regarding claim 7, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1, including the step of sending an identification of the first control node as part of each call control handover between control nodes that occurs after the call control has been handed over to the gateway control node (column 2, line 54).

Regarding claim 16, Valentine teaches of a method of operating a reliable link protocol, comprising the step of setting, at an exchange identifier negotiation, time out values before an exchange identifier command is sent again, on different values for call originating user equipment and a call user equipment (column 6, lines 41-46).

Regarding claim 11, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1, wherein the method is performed in a Universal Mobile Telephone System (UMTS) or a Global System for Mobile Communication (GSM) network (column 3, lines 37-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 8, 12, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine (Valentine et al, US Patent No. 6504839) in view of Liu (Liu, Patent No. 6,130879).

Regarding claim 2, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1.

Valentine does not teach of where the first control node seizes first payload transmission resources, and the control node that controls the access network serving the called party seizes second payload transmission resources before comparison of parameter values is performed, which describes possible payload connections between the core network and the first access network, with parameter values of possible payload connections between the core network and the access network serving the called party.

Liu in related art teaches of where the first control node seizes first payload transmission resources, and the control node that controls the access network serving the called party seizes second payload transmission resources before comparison of parameter values is performed, which describes possible payload connections between the core network and the first access network, with parameter values of possible payload connections between the core network and the access network serving the called party (column 10, lines 50-59).

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included into Valentine's invention, Liu's teachings of the first control node seizing first payload transmission resources, and the control node that controls the access network serving the called party seizes second payload transmission resources before comparison of parameter values is performed, which describes possible payload connections between the core network and the first access network, with parameter values of possible payload connections between the core network and the access network serving the called party.

Regarding claim 3, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1.

Valentine does not teach changing a payload transmission and executing a further comparison and selection.

Liu in related art teaches changing a payload transmission and executing a further comparison and selection (column 4, lines 30-41).

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included into Valentine's invention, Liu's teachings of changing a payload transmission and executing a further comparison and selection.

Regarding claim 4, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1.

Valentine does not teach including the step where at least one transmission converter is linked in for the payload transmission.

In related art dealing with data connections, Liu teaches of at least one transmission converter linked in for the payload transmission. (column 4, lines 42-45).

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included into Valentine's invention, Liu's teachings of at least one transmission converter linked in for the payload transmission.

Regarding claim 8, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1.

Valentine does not teach the step of performing comparison and selection of transcodings and rate adaptations after the called party accepts the connection.

In related art dealing with data connections, Liu teaches the step of performing comparison and selection of transcodings and rate adaptations after the called party accepts the connection (column 9, lines 52-60).

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included into Valentine's invention to include Liu's step of performing comparison and selection of transcodings and rate adaptations after the called party accepts the connection.

Regarding claim 12, Valentine teaches of a network node for a cellular communication network that offers data connections, comprising a connection calculation unit for the calculation of parameter values describing possible payload connections between said network node and an access network

Valentine does not teach of a parameter comparison unit for the comparison of thed calculated parameter values with parameter values received from a further network node and a processing unit for handling input and output of parameter values, and seizure of payload transmission resources and the set up and through-connection of a payload connection.

Liu teaches of a parameter comparison unit for the comparison of the calculated parameter values with parameter values received from a further network node and a processing unit for handling input and output of parameter values, and seizure of payload transmission resources and the set up and through-connection of a payload connection (column 10, pages 51-58).

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included into Valentine's invention, Liu's parameter comparison unit for the comparison of said calculated parameter values with parameter values received from a further network node and a processing unit for handling input and output of parameter values, and seizure of payload transmission resources and the set up and through-connection of a payload connection.

Regarding claim 13, Valentine teaches of a network node for a cellular communication network that offers data connections comprising a connection

Art Unit: 2684

calculation unit for the calculation of parameter values describing possible payload connections between said network node and an access network.

Valentine does not teach of a processing unit for handling input and output of parameter values, and seizure of payload transmission resources and the set up and through-connection of a payload connection.

Liu teaches a processing unit for handling input and output of parameter values, and seizure of payload transmission resources and the set up and through-connection of a payload connection as an inherited extension of the system.

Regarding claim 15, Valentine teaches each limitation as stated in claim 1.

Valentine does not teach of a computer program stored on computer readable medium or in a computer memory that can execute a method according to claim 1.

Liu's art suggests, as an inherent part of the system, a computer program stored on computer readable medium or in a computer memory that can execute a method according to claim 1(column 10, lines 51-58).

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include Liu's inherent computer program stored on computer readable medium or in a computer memory that can execute a method according to claim 1.

4. Claims 9, 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Malmlof (Malmlof, US Patent No. 6594241 B1).

Art Unit: 2684

Regarding claim 10, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1.

Valentine does not teach of the access networks being identical.

Malmlof, in related art, teaches of the access networks being identical (figure 4, items 25).

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include Malmlof 's identical access networks so that,

If one of the networks malfunctions, then, the other will pick up.

Regarding claim 9, Valentine teaches of a method according to claim 1.

Valentine does not teach of at least two of the control nodes being identical.

Malmlof, in related art concerning switching controls, teaches of at least two of the control nodes being identical (figure 4, items 25).

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included into Valentine's invention, Malmlof's idea of at least two of the control nodes being identical as an inherent characteristic of two identical access networks described in claim 10.

Regarding claim 14, Valentine teaches of a cellular communication network, comprising a first access network and a core network, performing a method for the set up of data connections according to claim 1.

Valentine does not teach of a second access network. Malmlof teaches of a second access network (figure 4, item 25).

Art Unit: 2684

Page 10

It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include Malmlof 's second access network so that, if one of the networks malfunctions, the other will pick up.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angelica Perez whose telephone number is 703-305-8730. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m., Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600's customer service number is 703-306-0377.

NAY MAUNG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit 2684

Angelica Perez (Examiner)

Art Unit: 2684

October 20, 2003

Page 11